

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: Bill VanAlstyne <bill@starquest.com>
Subject: Adventurer / T-50: Twins?
Message-ID: <199511182315.AA13174@cruz.com>

I am looking at the article about the Johnson Adventurer in the October 95 Electric Radio, and while I was aware that the Adventurer was basically similar in concept and power-level to the Knight-Kit T-50 I had years ago, I didn't know *how* similar until I saw these pictures.

Here is the same exact panel layout -- same controls and switches, same locations, seemingly down to the millimeter. Here is the same chassis layout, right down to the same high-quality ceramic coil forms, variable caps (I remember the T-50 had Johnson variables), the recessed socket for the 807, the chassis ventilation holes, the parasitic suppressor going to a stand-off adjacent to the 807 -- *everything* exactly the same, and I have a *very* clear mental picture of the insides of that T-50! Even the "undamped" (per the ER article -- was it ever!) meter movement looks the same, except for the bezel and Johnson logo.

In fact, the only difference I can see between the two rigs is the cabinet and panel construction concept, the paint scheme, and the style of knobs.

The Heath AT-1 and DX-20 are mentioned as being comparable rigs, but I know both of those rigs were substantially different in many ways. The ER article doesn't mention the T-50 at all. The Adventurer looks to me to *be* a T-50 in Johnson clothing -- or rather, more likely, the T-50 was an Adventurer in Allied/Knight clothing!

Wonder if anyone can confirm that this is really the same rig, maybe even the same exact schematic, parts list, and assembly layout as the T-50? Did Johnson perhaps license it to Allied as-is?

Bill VanAlstyne. N6FN
bill@starquest.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: KC5IJD@aol.com
Subject: ARC-112 modules
Message-ID: <951118095530_110002415@emout05.mail.aol.com>

Have a number of modules for the Collins ARC-112 (a repackaged 618T).

Am about ready to tear them for parts down as I don't have the space to store them any longer.

If you want/need any of the modules for the RT part of this set, please let me know. Otherwise they are gone.

Also, may still have one complete RT unit (not the power amp).

73

Joseph W Pinner
Lafayette, LA
KC5IJD
EMail: kc5ijd@aol.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: jml@spider.lloyd.com (Jim Lockwood)
Subject: GSB-100: What am I doing wrong?
Message-ID: <m0tGv1F-000TrPC@spider.lloyd.com>

I've been tweaking the sideband supression today on my GSB-100 of some 30 years and have gotten myself into a confusing situation. The problem is that the signal strength out of the GSB-100 is much, much greater in USB than in LSB. I don't understand this and I haven't been able to change it.

Sideband supression, mind you, is pretty darn good in either case. However, the "christmas tree" waveform I see on my scope when I modulate the xmtr is fatter, fuller, and has higher peaks in the USB position than it does in LSB. Interestingly, when I listen to the signal with a receiver, I don't hear any difference in audio quality between USB and LSB.

This is a phasing type rig. To get to the point where carrier and unwanted sideband are reasonably reduced involves iterative tweaking of a total of five controls: two for carrier balance, two for audio balance, and one for RF balance.

I've stared at this thing so long that I can't see the forrest for the trees. What could be going on to cause this USB/LSB difference I'm seeing? What am I overlooking?

TIA,

Jim - km6nk

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995

From: "Allan Fritsche" <fritsche@msn.com>
Subject: Heath HR-10B
Message-ID: <UPMAIL03.199511182225110726@msn.com>

I obtained a Hr-10B Heathkit receiver about 20 years ago from the old Madison electronics store in Houston. Everything is functional but whoever wired it must have lost the included wiring as some of it is done in what looks like 26 gauge. I have played with it on and off for the last few months and while it works it looks like I will probably have to rewire most of it. I did get the Heath Manual a long time ago and am having trouble aligning, appears to be too much gain when I really peak the IF's, so I aligned on noise and all seems well. The reason I am writing all this garbage is, is this radio considered a boat anchor yet?, Is it worth anything?, or does anybody want it. When I was 13, (1960) my dad bought me a R-100a kit, which I was able to put together, About 1964 I traded it for a guitar at a pawn shop. (I imagined I was a Beatle). He also bought me a brand spanking new National NC-60 which I liked a lot. Basically what I am asking is there some one who has a nc-60 or r-100a that would like to trade in Houston, if not in Houston I will help with shipping cost. The hr-10b must weigh about 17 pounds and is in very good shape appearance wise.

Al Fritsche
fritsche@msn.com
fritsche@att.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: Nina West <ninaw@u.washington.edu>
Subject: Need info on Leader LB0-501 O'scope and LS-5 Electronic Switch
Message-ID: <Pine.A32.3.91j.951117190047.95733D-100000@homer15.u.washington.edu>

Someday I hope to own a real Tektronics, but today I am stuck with the above units (\$5 each at a garage sale and operational). There are a couple of tubes inside, so it barely passes the BA kosher test. Anybody have manuals? I would appreciate any info, even derogatory comments.
thanks
Fred Powell
c/o
ninaw@u.washington.edu

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995

From: maccary@on-ramp.ior.com
Subject: Rush boxes and other nonsense
Message-ID: <m0tGrw3-000RtwC@on-ramp.ior.com>

Several people have posted reports about their efforts to leap back into the past and build one tube Hartley oscillator transmitters using maybe a type 45 or for high power a type 10 tube. I thought I'd attack this problem from the other side and after thumbing through my 1932 ARRL Handbook, Gernsback's 1934 Short Wave Manual, and a 1936 handbook, I settled on the "Old Reliable" TRF described in the 1936 volume.

"Old Reliable" is a three tube regenerative receiver using a pentode RF amplifier, a pentode regenerative detector and a triode audio amplifier. The Handbook suggests using two type 58's and a 56 or two 6D6's and a 76. Lacking any 56 type tubes and not finding a 2.5 volt filament transformer led me to the use of the 6D6-76 combo. The junk box offered up a Bud cabinet with a chassis already punched for a couple of tubes; two 6 prong ceramic sockets; eight plug in coil forms; two 140 pF and two 35 pf variables; a National Velvet Vernier; and what luck, a 600 Henry (yes Henry) audio choke for the detector plate load.

The original article showed a 30 Henry choke in the audio amp plate circuit but I used an interstage transformer with a plate impedance of about 30 and a multi tap secondary that would match my high impedance head phones. My only concessions to modernity were to use a full wave bridge diode in place of the 80 and a BNC antenna connector.

The four sets of coils tune from the middle of the BC band up to the top of the 20 meter band with too much overlap so maybe I'll rewind some of them. Finding the right spot for the cathode tap was pretty much trial and error because my coil forms are 1/4 inch smaller in diameter than the ones called out in the specs. Too much tap and the detector oscillates continuously, too little tap and it won't regenerate at all. Everything considered, it works OK.

I built my first regenerative receiver about 1937 and used it to listen to the BBC and hams of course but I'd forgotten how tricky they tune until building this one.

This one does tune strangely. The other night on the BC band I heard Amos n' Andy and a while later Father Coughlin followed by the Green Hornet and Walter Winchell. On the 31 meter band Adolph Hitler was making a speech to the Reichstag and Nevill Chamberlin talked of "peace in our time". I even heard Franklin's fireside chat where he told us "we have nothing to fear but fear itself".

Think I'll next build a crystal set and see if it will tune in "S" from Poldhu or maybe hear John Phillips sending CQD-CQD-CQD de SS Titanic.

Mac, W0NAX

Lawrence M. MacCary --- A Subscriber at Internet On-Ramp, Inc.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: USSAILIS@forum.phast.umass.edu
Subject: Shipping BA Stuff
Message-ID: <01HXROAULDGY8Y56BK@oitvms.oit.umass.edu>

A few years ago I was shipping instrumentation radars and assoc electronics on Eastern AL using their "cost-cutter" box system. Same \$ as truck. Heavy, large electronics shipped cheap. Did anyone pick-up this service??

Jim, W1EQ0

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: Grant Youngman <gyoungma@gtetel.com>
Subject: Re: Shipping BA Transmitters
Message-ID: <Chameleon.951118101644.gyoungma@gyoungma.gtetel.com>

>
>One of my DX-100s came from Denver via UPS before UPS would handle more than
>about 75 lbs. Out of necessity, the shipper removed the HV transformer,
>the large PS choke, and all the tubes. This allowed him to reduce the
>weight of the rig such that no one box was more than the UPS limits.
>

I think this is absolutely good advice, weight limits or not. One 90 lb BA transmitter I received had not had the large tubes removed. Of course they bounced out of their sockets and became glass projectiles that destroyed other tubes and themselves -- to a very expensive replacement tune, well above the insurance payment from the shipper. The power transformer, while it did not come loose, was pulled up on its mountings -- one more bounce in its probably upside down shipping condition might well have snapped it loose and been the unrestorable death knell for a fine old BA.

Grant

Grant Youngman -- NQ5T

WANTED: Hammarlund SPC-10

gyoungma@gtetel.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: Chris Sieg <c_sieg@conknet.com>
Subject: Shipping BAs
Message-ID: <Chameleon.4.01.2.951117222344.c_sieg@PIEXX.conknet.com>

My company ships a lot of electronic equipment. I would estimate that about 3 percent of the packages we ship arrive at their destination damaged. All of the packages we ship conform to the standards of the shipper. Occasionally someone will ship us a package with the contents jammed into the shipping container. Hit rates on items poorly packed is about one damaged in four received. You must use a lot of packing materials on heavy items, but don't have any false hopes, shippers will mishandle your merchandise from time to time. Two items we shipped come to mind:

1. A VGA monitor was shipped to a customer in TN in the mfg's shipping container, lots of foam ect. The neck of the CRT was snapped off when the monitor arrived. Think about how many G's that would take!

2. We shipped a 1 square foot granite surface plate in a wooden crate to the west coast, it arrived shattered. The surface plate was 4 inches thick!!!

Bye the way, it seems like standard practice for shippers to initially deny insurance claims. If your merchandise is mishandled, don't let them get away with it pursue your claim untill you are properly compensated.

-Chris

Name: Chris Sieg WA3LDI
E-mail: c_sieg@mail.conknet.com (Chris Sieg)
From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: LBLASKE@aol.com
Subject: Shipping really, really big BA's
Message-ID: <951117231453_109737640@emout04.mail.aol.com>

Hello to all:

About two years ago, I got a real itch to collect some old Heath BA's -- the Apache, Marauder, Mohawk and Warrior series. I tried a bunch of different methods. Luckily, everything came through OK.

1.) Removing heavy transformers and chokes is a good way to reduce weight, but make sure that the person doing the removal job is motivated to do the work carefully. This can be a good way to really hack up the leads on a hard to replace transformer! I recommend putting shrink wrap on the leads when re-installing these components. Old varnished cloth insulation can be a bit brittle.

2.) I've had good luck with UPS. My regular delivery guy is a champ. He even brings treats for the dogs! Taking for granted that with modern package handling equipment your package will get pretty good treatment before your delivery guy gets it, if you have a good person -- you're home free. If you don't have a good person, camp by the door and run out to help when they arrive. Our two Welsh Pembroke Corgis earn their keep by letting me know when any delivery truck is in the area!

3.) Fed-ex will ship some pretty heavy stuff, and do it well. It's quite expensive, however.

4.) If you ship my motor freight, pack your equipment as if it's going to go through a war. For small shipments, motor freight is expensive. It's a good way to move a steel radio tower, though!

5.) If you've got a fairly big shipment, and are located in a major metro area -- whole house contents moving carriers like Mayflower are an option if you can get your load to piggy-back with another bigger load heading in the same direction. Some firms are more eager to do this than others.

Theoretically, you don't even need to package it if you send it this way.

They'll wrap it in blankets and treat it like furniture. Some of these outfits even have special divisions that do nothing but handle big electronic equipment. If you work it right, this service can be reasonably priced. If you don't work it right, it can cost an arm and a leg!

Lee AA0EF

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: w7ni@teleport.com (Stan Griffiths)
Subject: Tek 556
Message-ID: <199511180742.XAA16615@desiree.teleport.com>

>Hi Stan,

>

>Haven't yet scrounged the pennies to get your book, but if you don't mind a
>question - in most all of the Tek traffic here, it seems that every model

>is mentioned from the 53x-55x ("letter series"?) era except mine - a 556.
>Not expecting a lot of detail here, but can you help me understand where
>the 556 fits into the series?
>
>Thanks de KC4EWT
>Johnson_Dan@aac.com
>

Hi OM,

In my opinion, the 556 is really the very best in the entire 530/540/550 series of instruments. I know "best" is a subjective term. Let me explain.

530 Series:

This is the first of the "letter series" scopes to be produced beginning with the 531. The bandwidth began at about 11 MHz and the last models were 15 MHz. there are a couple of "oddballs" in the 530 series: 532 with only 5 MHz of bandwidth and the 536 optimized for "X-Y" use with no built-in timebase.

540 Series:

These came along after the 530 series with the biggest improvement being increased bandwidth to 30 MHz. One sacrifice was a decrease in screen size from 6 x 10 cm for the 530 Series to 4 x 10 cm for the 540 series. For several years the 530 and 540 Series were both produced. The 530 Series faded away as the 540 Series was improved yet again by increasing the bandwidth to 50 MHz, and expanding the screen size to 6 x 10 cm. The popular 547 is an example of the last 540 effort. It has been said (by people other than me) that the 547 is quite probably one of the very best examples of tube technology at its very best. The 547 was not ALL tubes though and made use of several transistors and, most important, tunnel diodes in the trigger circuit.

550 Series:

The first of this series was the 551. Every member of this series is pretty heavy because they have so much in them. For example, they are all true "dual beam" scopes, as opposed to "dual trace" where the CRT has two independent electron guns rather than one gun time-shared by two input channels. Each of those guns can be operated dual trace if desired. They all require two plugins (one for each gun) and the 551 and 555 had their power supplies in boxes separate from the scope mainframe. The 551 and 555 had screen areas that were 6 x 10 cm but each gun could only write on a 4 x 10 area. The center 2 x 10 cm screen area was used by both guns. Bandwidth was 25 MHz for the 551 and 30 MHz for the 555. The 555 had two independent timebases in it, too, as opposed to one in the 551. This made it like two

scopes in one box.

Enter the 556: Still dual beam, the screen area was increased to 8 x 10 cm with each beam accessing a 6 x 10 cm area and the two guns overlapping in the center 2 x 10 area. The bandwidth was increased to 50 MHz and the power supply was moved into the scope mainframe. Tunnel diodes were used in the trigger circuits of both timebases and several transistors were used in various key places. The 556 is truly a marvelous engineering feat and has my vote for the most advanced and well-done application of tube technology that I have ever seen. If you have a 556, you have a "boatanchor" that could anchor a battleship (83 lb.) The last 556 was produced in 1974 and sold for \$4100. This scope should be sitting next to your vintage Rolls Royce.

Please don't think you are imposing on me when you ask me to talk about Tek scopes. I could write a book on them . . . maybe even two books.

Stan W7NI@teleport.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: Terry Pridgen <pridgent@pinn.net>
Subject: Vintage Vibroplex Key
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.951118120605.29743A@everest>

Would appreciate any information on a Vibroplex bug. I'm told its from the 1920's. The only identifying info I can find is serial number 111393 on a the gold Vibroplex label. I realize that this is not much to go one, but someone may have info on the association of model numbers and serial numbers.
73 de Terry KC4YTF//pridgent@pinn.net

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: n6nae@ix.netcom.com (Richard Humphrey)
Subject: WANTED:
Message-ID: <199511180404.UAA15127@ix12.ix.netcom.com>

I'm looking for the following:

Manual for Collins 32S-1 transmitter. Winged emblem. Would prefer real thing, but....

Manual for TMC GPR-90 receiver. Real thing or good repro is fine.

'E' dial scale for HRO-50T1.

Richard
N6NAE@ix.netcom.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: MODSTEPH@ACS.EKU.EDU
Subject: WTB DX-40 xfrmr
Message-ID: <01HXS67RAUNM001QIO@ACS.EKU.EDU>

Having turned on the restored DX-40 and VF-1, I left it to warm up while I got coffee. I returned quickly when the smoke alarm over the operating position went off - but by then it was too late. The rectifier had shorted and the transformer was dead.

I suppose I can try to take the thing apart (after reading recent posts here that starts becoming a possibility), but would much prefer replacing the thing SO --

Need one power transformer for Heath DX-40 transmitter, if anyone has a spare parts one... or knows of anywhere I could try for a replacement.

Thanks.

73, Al N5AIT
modsteph@eku.edu
Allan Stephens
106 Bobolink Drive
Richmond, Kentucky 40475

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995
From: w7ni@teleport.com (Stan Griffiths)
Subject: Re: WWV operations
Message-ID: <199511180742.XAA16635@desiree.teleport.com>

>WWV is also used by the electronics industry now in manufacturing. I know
>Tek's Communication Group (spectrum analyzers, TV products, etc.) has the
>time source piped to the technician benches. Not sure how they use it though.
>
>Terry
>KI7M

>

In Field Service at Tek, we used to tune in WWV directly on a SW receiver at 10 MHz and beat its carrier against our 10 MHz oven-controlled crystal oscillators in the generators we used to set scope timebases. In this way, we could get direct traceability to NBS (National Bureau of Standards, now NIST) without ever having to take the generators anywhere for calibration.

Stan W7NI@teleport.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995

From: Michael Covington <mcovingt@ai.uga.edu>

Subject: Re: WWV operations

Message-ID: <199511181651.LAA11863@aisun3.ai.uga.edu>

Stan Griffiths writes:

> In Field Service at Tek, we used to tune in WWV directly on a SW receiver at
> 10 MHz and beat its carrier against our 10 MHz oven-controlled crystal
> oscillators in the generators we used to set scope timebases. In this way,
> we could get direct traceability to NBS (National Bureau of Standards, now
> NIST) without ever having to take the generators anywhere for calibration.

I've actually built a small direct-conversion receiver which I hook up to my antenna and my frequency counter for listening to WWV at 10 MHz. It provides quick confirmation that the frequency counter is in tune. Maybe WWV receivers should be built into frequency counters...?

--

Michael A. Covington
Artificial Intelligence Center
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602-7415 U.S.A.

<http://www.ai.uga.edu/faculty/covington/>
<><
Unless specifically indicated, I am
not speaking for the University.

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sun Nov 19 02:00:00 1995

From: Bob Roehrig <broehrig@admin.aurora.edu>

Subject: Re: WWV operations

Message-ID: <Pine.ULT.3.91.951118111740.24881B-100000@admin.aurora.edu>

On Sat, 18 Nov 1995, Michael Covington wrote:

> Stan Griffiths writes:

>

> > In Field Service at Tek, we used to tune in WWV directly on a SW receiver at
> > 10 MHz and beat its carrier against our 10 MHz oven-controlled crystal

> > oscillators in the generators we used to set scope timebases. In this way,
> > we could get direct traceability to NBS (National Bureau of Standards, now
> > NIST) without ever having to take the generators anywhere for calibration.

>

> I've actually built a small direct-conversion receiver which I hook up to
> my antenna and my frequency counter for listening to WWV at 10 MHz. It
> provides quick confirmation that the frequency counter is in tune. Maybe
> WWV receivers should be built into frequency counters...?

>

NIST documents will tell you that the best accuracy you can get by beating
against the WWV / WWVH HF carriers is 10^{-7} . This is probably good
enough for many uses and probably better than not calibrating your counter.
If you are trying to put a VHF or UHF set on frequency, it would provide
marginal results.

Bob, K9EUI